HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 200401716-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): John APOSTOLOPOULOS et al.

Confirmation No.: 8407

Application No.: 10/810,025

Examiner: Daniel L. HOANG

Filing Date: 03/26/2004

Group Art Unit: 2436

Title: METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR GENERATING TRANSCODABLE ENCRYPTED CONTENT

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Reply Brief with respect to the Examiner's Answer mailed on 03/03/2009 .

This Reply Brief is being filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.193(b) within two months of the date of the Examiner's Answer.

(Note: Extensions of time are not allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a))

(Note: Failure to file a Reply Brief will result in dismissal of the Appeal as to the claims made subject to an expressly stated new ground rejection.)

No fee is required for filing of this Reply Brief.

If any fees are required please charge Deposit Account 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,
John APOSTOLOPOULOS et al.

By: /John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg No. : 35,398
Date : 05/04/2009
Telephone : 408-377-0500

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant:	APOSTOLOPOULOS et al.	Patent Application	
Application No.:	10/810,025	Group Art Unit:	2436
Filed:	March 26, 2004	Examiner:	Hoang, Daniel L.

For: METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR GENERATING TRANSCODABLE ENCRYPTED CONTENT

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on March 3, 2009, Appellants respectfully submits the following remarks.

REMARKS

Appellants are submitting the following remarks in response to the Examiner's Answer. In these remarks, Appellants are addressing certain arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer. While only certain arguments are addressed in this Reply Brief, this should not be construed that Appellants agree with the other arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer.

Response to Response to Argument in Examiner's Answer

First, Appellants understand the Examiner's Answer to assert that "the Appellant's definition of 'independently processable components' is as follows: 'independently identifiable components that can be independently (e.g. separately) encrypted/decrypted, encoded/decoded and authenticated'. It is the examiner's understanding of the current claim language that as long as the content components can be encrypted/decrypted independently, they can be considered independently processable components" (Examiner's Answer; page 7, lines 3-7). Appellants respectfully disagree.

Appellants note that independent Claim 1 recites "accessing transcodable content that comprises independently processable components to be encrypted; and encrypting at least one of said independently processable components to provide independently processable components which are independently decryptable" (emphasis added). Independent Claims 12 and 24 include similar embodiments.

Appellants note that the assertion in the Examiner's Answer that "independently identifiable components that can be independently (e.g. separately) encrypted/decrypted" is not supported by the claim language because Claim 1 specifically recites "independently processable

components to be encrypted" (emphasis added). Moreover, Claim 1 distinguishes between "independently processable components" and "independently processable components which are independently decryptable" (emphasis added). Therefore, the assertion that "as long as the content components can be encrypted/decrypted independently, they can be considered independently processable components" is not supported by the claims.

Second, Appellants understand the Examiner's Answer to assert that "it is clear from appellant's definition that processing is intended to mean encrypting/decrypting" (Examiner's Answer; page 7, lines 16-17). Appellants respectfully disagree. As presented above, Claim 1 distinguishes between "independently processable components" and "independently processable components which are independently decryptable" (emphasis added). Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that the assertion that "it is clear from appellant's definition that processing is intended to mean encrypting/decrypting" is not supported by the claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Appellants continue to assert that pending Claims 1-34 are patentable over the asserted art as the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) do not satisfy the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, for reasons presented above and for reasons previously presented in the Appeal Brief.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: May 4, 2009

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration Number: 35,398

WAGNER BLECHER LLP
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500